



HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP

TUESDAY, February 12, 2013 at 12:00 NOON

HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL

HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING

TUESDAY, February 12, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.

CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS

A M E N D E D

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 22, 2013

E. COMMUNICATIONS

F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-12-090 435 San Antonio Street  
Case #H-12-077 1148 Camino San Acacio  
Case #H-12-097B 704 Camino Lejo

Case #H-13-002 318 Delgado Street  
Case #H-13-003 206 McKenzie Street  
Case #H-13-001 707 Don Gaspar Avenue

G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-12-005. 9 Camino Pequino. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan, agent for Carlie & BC Rimbeaux, owners, proposes to construct an approximately 5,448 sq. ft. 14' high residence and detached guesthouse in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, where the maximum allowable height is 15'6". (John Murphey).
2. Case #H-13-004. 918 E. Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Eastside Partiners LLC, owners, proposes to construct an approximately 1,325 sq. ft. 15'9", the maximum allowable height, addition to this non-contributing residence. (John Murphey).
3. Case #H-13-005. 512 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Donald and Katherine Wallace, owners, propose to replace windows and modify rear portal roof on a non-contributing residence, construct a 128 sq. ft. addition and an awning over the entry door on a non-contributing guest house, modify the vehicle gate, and construct an outdoor fireplace and BBQ. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-13-006. 540 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Aaron Bohrer, agent for Meem-Santa Fe LP, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by increasing the heights of lower parapets while maintaining room-block massing, constructing a 209 sq. ft. pergola and courtyard walls to 5' high with pedestrian gates, and perform other minor modifications. (David Rasch).

5. Case #H-13-010. 303 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Wayne S. Lloyd, agent for Schepps/New Mexico, owner, proposes to construct an approximately 600 sq. ft. 14' high porte-cochere and connected entry pergola across this non-contributing commercial building. (John Murphey)
6. Case #H-13-009. 1020 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cody North, agent for 1020 CNYN LLC, owners, proposes to remodel three contributing residences and two non-contributing residences into three residences with additions at 473 sq. ft. between 1020 and 1020A, 487 sq. ft. between 1020C and 1020D, and 662 sq. ft. on 1020B. In addition, a 420 sq. ft. carport and yardwalls will be constructed. The exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary façade (Section 14- 5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

**I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. Persons who wish to attend the Historic Districts Review Board Field Trip must notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 am on the date of the Field Trip.



**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD FIELD TRIP**

**TUESDAY, February 12, 2013 at 12:00 NOON**

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION DIVISION, 2<sup>nd</sup> FLOOR CITY HALL**

**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD HEARING**

**TUESDAY, February 12, 2013 at 5:30 P.M.**

**CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

- A. CALL TO ORDER
- B. ROLL CALL
- C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
- D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 22, 2013
- E. COMMUNICATIONS
- F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Case #H-12-090 435 San Antonio Street  
Case #H-12-077 1148 Camino San Acacio  
Case #H-12-097B 704 Camino Lejo

Case #H-13-002 318 Delgado Street  
Case #H-13-003 206 McKenzie Street  
Case #H-13-001 707 Don Gaspar Avenue

- G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR
- H. ACTION ITEMS

1. Case #H-12-005. 9 Camino Pequino. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan, agent for Carlie & BC Rimbeaux, owners, proposes to construct an approximately 5,448 sq. ft. 14' high residence and detached guesthouse in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, where the maximum allowable height is 15'6". (John Murphey).
2. Case #H-13-004. 918 E. Acequia Madre. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Eastside Partiners LLC, owners, proposes to construct an approximately 1,325 sq. ft. 15'9", the maximum allowable height, addition to this non-contributing residence. (John Murphey).
3. Case #H-13-005. 512 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martinez Architecture Studio, agent for Donald and Katherine Wallace, owners, propose to replace windows and modify rear portal roof on a non-contributing residence, construct a 128 sq. ft. addition and an awning over the entry door on a non-contributing guest house, modify the vehicle gate, and construct an outdoor fireplace and BBQ. (David Rasch).
4. Case #H-13-006. 540 E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Aaron Bohrer, agent for Meem-Santa Fe LP, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by increasing the heights of lower parapets while maintaining room-block massing, constructing a 209 sq. ft. pergola and courtyard walls to 5' high with pedestrian gates, and perform other minor modifications. (David Rasch).

5. Case #H-13-008. 645 ½ E. Palace Avenue. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Christopher Purvis, agent for Todd Davis and Chris Richter, owners, proposes to construct a 150 sq. ft. portal, increase the height of lower parapets while maintaining room-block massing, restore brick coping, repair historic windows on the primary elevation, install skylights, replace windows on a non-primary elevations and insulate and restucco a contributing residence, to construct a 720 sq. ft. studio to a height of 13' and a 550 sq. ft. carport to a height of 11' where the maximum allowable height is 17' and to construct a 6' high wall, a 6' high coyote fence, and horse fencing. (David Rasch).
6. Case #H-13-010. 303 E. Alameda. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Wayne S. Lloyd, agent for Schepps/New Mexico, owner, proposes to construct an approximately 600 sq. ft. 14' high porte-cochere and connected entry pergola across this non-contributing commercial building. (John Murphey)
7. Case #H-13-009. 1020 Canyon Road. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cody North, agent for 1020 CNYN LLC, owners, proposes to remodel three contributing residences and two non-contributing residences into three residences with additions at 473 sq. ft. between 1020 and 201A, 487 sq. ft. between 1020D and 1020E, and 662 sq. ft. on 1020C. In addition, a 420 sq. ft. carport and yardwalls will be constructed. The exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary façade (Section 14- 5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch).

**I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Cases on this agenda may be postponed to a later date by the Historic Districts Review Board at the noticed meeting. Please contact the Historic Preservation Division at 955-6605 for more information regarding cases on this agenda.

Persons with disabilities in need of accommodation or an interpreter for the hearing impaired should contact the City Clerk's office at 955-6520 at least five (5) working days prior to the hearing date. Persons who wish to attend the Historic Districts Review Board Field Trip must notify the Historic Preservation Division by 9:00 am on the date of the Field Trip.

**SUMMARY INDEX**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**  
February 12, 2013

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>ACTION TAKEN</b>	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
Approval of Agenda	Approved as amended	1-2
Approval of Minutes		
January 22, 2013	Approved as amended	2
Communications	Reported	2
Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law	Approved as amended	2-3
Business from the Floor	None	3
 Action Items		
1. <u>Case #H-12-005.</u> 9 Camino Pequeño	Approved with conditions	5-10
2. <u>Case #H-13-004</u> 918 E. Acequia Madre	Approved with conditions	10-12
3. <u>Case #H-13-005</u> 512 Calle Corvo	Approved with conditions	12-14
4. <u>Case #H-13-006</u> 540 E. Palace Avenue	Approved with conditions	14-18
5. <u>Case #H-13-010</u> 303 E. Alameda	Approved with conditions	18-20
6. <u>Case #H-13-009</u> 1020 Canyon Road	Approved with conditions	20-35
 Matters from the Board	Discussion	35-36
 Adjournment	Adjourned at 8:22 p.m.	36

**MINUTES OF THE**  
**CITY OF SANTA FÉ**  
**HISTORIC DISTRICTS REVIEW BOARD**

**February 12, 2013**

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

A regular meeting of the City of Santa Fé Historic Districts Review Board was called to order by Chair Sharon Woods on the above date at approximately 5:30 p.m. in the Lamy Room of the Santa Fé Community convention Center, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Roll Call indicated the presence of a quorum as follows:

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Ms. Sharon Woods, Chair  
Ms. Cecilia Rios, Vice Chair  
Mr. Edward Boniface  
Dr. John Kantner  
Mr. Frank Katz  
Ms. Christine Mather  
Ms. Karen Walker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Mr. David Rasch, Historic Planner Supervisor  
Mr. John Murphey, Senior Historic Planner  
Ms. Kelley Brennan, Assistant City Attorney  
Mr. Carl Boaz, Stenographer

**NOTE: All items in the Committee packet for all agenda items are incorporated herewith by reference. The original Committee packet is on file in the Historic Planning Department.**

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Ms. Rios moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: January 22, 2013**

Ms. Walker asked on page 11 what heated renovation driveways were. She asked if anyone knew.

Mr. Boaz said that was what she said on the recording.

Ms. Walker asked if she called it a renovation driveway.

Ms. Rios said that really didn't make sense.

Mr. Rasch said there really weren't a lot of them. There might be a lot of steeply renovated.

Ms. Walker said it was not renovated. There were a lot of steep north facing driveways in the neighborhood. She asked that it be changed to "steep north-facing driveways."

[Stenographer's note: Ms. Walker did say "heated renovation driveways."]

Ms. Walker asked for the following changes to the minutes:

On page 21 at the top, Mr. Benjamin's first name was Raphael, not Rachel.

On page 30 near the top, it said Mr. Katz asked for a condition that the white color be retained but Ms. Walker was the one who asked for the white color to be retained.

Ms. Mather asked for the following changes to the minutes:

On page 22 at the top, third sentence should say, "Ms. Mather asked if the third ~~Stewart~~-gallery was still something they planned on and what it would consist of."

On page 23, the second condition should read the fencing around the building be tan or natural or green.

On page 27 and on page 28 the correct spelling of Cleofas Jaramillo was with an "f."

Dr. Kantner requested the following changes to the minutes:

On page 28 in the middle, it should say, "Dr. Kantner wasn't convinced it should be significant because the important persons were not associated with the building." His point was not that they were not important

persons.

On page 30 in the middle of the page and the motion was made he proposed a friendly amendment to include façades 15, 16, 17, 18 and Ms. Mather did accept that as friendly after the discussion.

Ms. Mather agreed she accepted that but not the amendment on the color.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve the January 22, 2013 minutes as amended. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by majority voice vote with all voting in favor except Ms. Rios who abstained.**

## **E. COMMUNICATIONS**

Chair Woods welcomed Mr. Boniface to the Board.

Mr. Rasch said there were questions about properties at a former meeting. One was the Santa Fé Convention Center where on two façades some railings were removed without permission. He clarified that this Board could direct staff to have that application come forward to approve or deny the removal of those balustrades.

Chair Woods noted it would also have to have public notice and be considered at a future meeting. Mr. Rasch agreed.

The other question was on East DeVargas and after research, determined there were not permits for several of the renovations seen on the site visit. So the City would issue violation notice to the property owner and that would start the process for approving or not those renovations.

Ms. Brennan arrived at this point.

Chair Woods asked about the public notices.

Mr. Rasch had consulted with the City Attorney on the two concerns about public notice visibility and structure visibility.

Ms. Brennan quoted the notice provisions from the code. At least one poster must be visible from each public and private street and road abutting the property and securely placed on the property. So the postings for this agenda met the posting requirement.

She asked regarding structure visibility if the question was whether a social trail was a public way.

Chair Woods said no. The question was at what point the City considered public visibility in relation to where the signs were posted and whether a notice could be posted on a private roadway.



Ms. Brennan clarified that the sign needed to be posted on the property closest to a public or private road. Camino Pequeño is a private way. Access to the public was really not relevant. The notice was posted on the property adjacent to the private way so the notice was sufficient. It was intended to notify those who would be immediately impacted by the project - meaning the neighbors. Public notice to the wider public was done on the web site, newspaper and posted outside this room.

Mr. Katz did not realize the posting could be on a private road but misunderstood in thinking it had to be on a public road. But thanks to the city attorney's help he now realized the private road was a public way.

Chair Woods was not talking about postings but only about visibility of the project. Ms. Brennan read that code section and said the property was publicly visible from Camino Pequeño.

Ms. Rios asked if the posting had to be on the public and private streets.

Ms. Brennan said it had to be either/or. Only the sign was to be visible on the street adjacent to the property.

Ms. Mather understood the posting had to be on the homeowner's property. Ms. Brennan agreed.

Dr. Kantner asked if it was visible from a public way because the public had access to Camino Pequeño. Ms. Brennan agreed.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Rasch if for the project needing to come before the Board whether that was administratively approvable.

Mr. Rasch said for the Convention Center, if the Board decided to approve removing the railings then they could remain as is. But if the Board decided to deny removing the railings then staff could administratively approve putting the balustrades back as they were before. For the ironwork on east DeVargas if they had no permit or approval to install the ironwork, that would need to come to the Board as character defining changes.

Mr. Katz understood with the posting that the signs had to be on the abutting street and if it was a private road it would be on a private road and if a public road, it would be on a public road or it could be two public roads like on Palace but the visibility was determined from a public road, not a private road. Since Camino Pequeño was a private road, it wouldn't be publicly visible. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Brennan said that was not correct. Publicly visible means a portion of a structure visible from a public street, way or other area to which the public has legal access. If it was gated off - often the public does use private ways to access those houses.

Chair Woods thanked her for the explanations.

## **F. FINDINGS OF FACT & CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

### **Case #H-12-090 435 San Antonio Street**

There were no changes to the case findings and conclusions for this case.

### **Case #H-12-077 1148 Camino San Acacio**

Ms. Walker wanted to know which version was the final version.

Mr. Murphey said he used Mr. Katz's version and struck the word "much" and changed two tenses for the final version.

### **Case #H-12-097B 704 Camino Lejo**

There were no changes to the case findings and conclusions for this case.

### **Case #H-13-002 318 Delgado Street**

There were no changes to the case findings and conclusions for this case.

### **Case #H-13-003 206 McKenzie Street**

There were no changes to the case findings and conclusions for this case.

### **Case #H-13-001 .707 Don Gaspar Avenue**

There were no changes to the case findings and conclusions for this case.

**Ms. Walker moved to approve them as presented. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

## **G. BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

There was no business from the floor.

Chair Woods announced to the public that anyone wishing to appeal a decision of the Board could file the appeal to the Governing Body within fifteen days after date of the approval of the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law.

## **H. ACTION ITEMS**

1. **Case #H-12-005 9 Camino Pequeño.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Trey Jordan, agent for Carlie and BC Rimbeaux, owners, proposes to construct an approximately 5,448 sq. ft. 14' high residence and detached guesthouse in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style, where the maximum allowable height is 15' 6". (John Murphey)  
Mr. Murphey presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Composed of adobe stables and sheds, with "modernist" stone additions made in the 1950s, and enclosed with fortress-like walls, the Board approved demolition of the downgraded Joseph B. and Jeanne Wertz house at the February 14, 2012 hearing under Case#H-12-005B. Subsequently, the Archaeological Review Committee approved a request to demolish the house and its associated outbuildings under Case#AR-11-12. As observed on the site visit earlier in the day, the property was demolished except for its south wall.

### **Project**

On the grounds of the former house—but pushed to the north to preserve river frontage—the applicant proposes to build a new residence.

The approximately 5,488 square-foot dwelling includes a main house and guesthouse clustered around two connected courtyards. The combined residence will reach 14'-0", below the 15'-6" maximum allowable height for the address.

It will be composed of a series of connected blocks of varying height and placement, creating a plan reflecting the admixture of the Spanish-Pueblo Revival and Modernist styles of the demolished dwelling. Of the former are the rounded parapet edges, stucco cladding and wood treatments; of the latter are the horizontal openings, full-glass windows and ashlar chimneys.

The house will be finished with traditional El Rey "Buckskin" stucco; its window clad with Loewen's "Terratone" color, a light brown tone.

The new design will incorporate small elements of the former Wertz residence, including a surviving wall, handcrafted ceramic lamps and pieces from an enamel wall sculpture.

The intent of the architect, as stated in the application letter, is "to create a building that does not feel of a specific time, but instead incorporates elements from the history of this property..., while preserving and restoring the open landscape and riverbank."

Staff believed the structure was visible from an oblique view of a partial elevation of the west side.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the application, as it complies with City of Santa Fe Land Use Code, Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Mather thought some of the windows might not comply with the 30" rule.

Mr. Murphey thought she was correct but it was only on the west elevation.

Chair Woods noted on the site plan at the corner of driveway and looking in you would also see south elevation.

Mr. Murphey said the change of topography would change the sight line and didn't think one would see all of it but maybe some of it.

Mr. Murphey shared the larger drawings with Ms. Mather.

Ms. Walker added information to Katherine Colby's inventory for the record. The property was built by Wertz, as documented in 1954 in Life Magazine and it showed courtyard pavers which were still extant when Carlie and BC bought the property a year ago. The inventory mistakenly said Susan Jones was renting it. She was the prior owner and lived there 35 years. Wertz sold it to his friend when he built 8 Camino Pequeño. The friend couldn't live there longer because of the altitude and donated it to St. John's College. Mr. David Jones was a tutor at St. John's College and purchased the house from the college and lived there from the sixties until his death. So on page 5 she would add Susan Hebert Jones to the list of knowledgeable people. She told Ms. Colby there was no Camino Pequeño at the time she lived there and the east façade of the house was the stable for the dude ranch on Upper Canyon and the only access to the stables was across the river. There are still remnants of that bridge across the river there.

Mr. Murphey thanked her for the information.

Present and sworn was Mr. Trey Jordan, 227 East Palace Avenue.

After reviewing the staff report he pointed out that the heated square footage was only a little over 2,900 which differed from the staff report. He had nothing else to add. He agreed with staff's recommendation.

Mr. Murphey clarified that his square footage was based on the roofed area.

Ms. Mather asked about the windows that might be affected by 30" rule.

Mr. Jordan said there were a number that were larger than 30" like was in the former residence and he felt confident they would not be visible from the end of Camino Pequeño.

He said they worked very hard to take a property that could be developed in a very visible way and did something very quiet there. A lot of aesthetics paid respect to what was a great old house. The house was dangerous from asbestos and mechanical and structural issues so they decided to start with a clean slate even though it was not their first intention. They tried to keep it as minimal as possible. It wasn't as short as the former house but still very low. A portion went up to 14' but they kept that up against the edge of the back. The owners lived up the hill on Cerro Gordo and bought this to prevent restricting access. They hired an arborist and they asked Mr. Jordan to interpret the house to the arborist.

There were parts of glazing exceeding 30" that were not under a portal.

Ms. Mather noted there were a lot of walls going around the house that would reduce their visibility too. Mr. Jordan agreed.

Ms. Mather asked about the gates on the south elevation that appeared to have hanging bells -

Mr. Jordan explained that were some of the light fixtures that they were reclaimed from the original house.

Ms. Mather asked him to describe the door treatments.

Mr. Jordan said what they contemplated was a mixture of doors mixing herringbone very simple with a carpenter style. On the main entry was a plain plank gate and to the right was a grille you could see through to peek at the courtyard. That was a reference to what was there before shown on page 15.

Ms. Mather asked if the next feature over was a window.

Mr. Jordan said it was just a wooden grille.

Ms. Rios asked if he felt this design reflected what was there before.

Mr. Jordan agreed. The Life Magazine article featured this as the house of the year in 1954 - a soft overlay of modern aesthetic. It had an organic feel. There was a free-standing piece of steel but when people walk that trail his clients were preserving they would not realize it was not the original house.

Ms. Rios asked what type of rock he was using.

Mr. Jordan said it would of rock on the property - just like the rock in the fireplace. It was not necessarily the same rock that was there before.

Ms. Rios asked if there would be anything on the roof.

Mr. Jordan said no.

He referred to page 17 that showed the rock. It would look like that but it would have narrower mortar joints.

Ms. Rios asked Mr. Murphey if the wall met the guidelines. Mr. Murphey agreed.

Ms. Walker pointed out the exhibit on the ceramic light fixture and said Mr. Wertz had a kiln in his workshop and made them there.

Mr. Jordan said they found many wonderful things that they were putting back into the house.

Dr. Kantner's concern was with the public visibility from the driveway of the southwest corner. He pointed out on the west elevation an opening with a horizontal grill.

Mr. Jordan explained it was not a glazed window but an opening into the garden.

Dr. Kantner asked if that was where he had the other wooden grill. Mr. Jordan agreed.

Dr. Kantner noted on the west elevation moving north there was an overhang projecting out in the corner where the fixtures were to be located. It was not clear but wondered how far out it projected.

Mr. Jordan said it was four feet. It had a steel fascia with vigas underneath.

Dr. Kantner asked if it was visible. It appeared there was nothing supporting it underneath. Mr. Jordan agreed it was a cantilever.

Chair Woods concluded there were two nonconforming elements in the new house. She asked how the code addressed that.

Mr. Jordan said- there should be no variances.

Chair Woods said they must if it was visible.

Ms. Brennan said the cantilevers were not limited by public visibility. It was a straightforward prohibition except over vigas or corbels. The 30" rule was only on publicly visible façades.

Chair Woods understood so the southwest corner was of concern.

Mr. Jordan said there were no windows on the southwest part. The cantilever at the front entry was visible. He said he didn't present anything to the Board that was not in keeping with the code.

Mr. Rasch quoted the code allowed projections up to 18" without support, up to 30" with corbels and up to 4' with a post.

Mr. Jordan apologized but would go with an 18" projection because he didn't want to add a column there.

Ms. Walker asked if on the floor plan on the north the acequia was shown. Mr. Jordan agreed.

Ms. Walker asked if it entered the courtyard.

Mr. Jordan said they were very aware of it and his client was the ditch boss.

Ms. Walker asked how the association would get in.

Mr. Jordan said that acequia didn't run much but there were two gates for them to use. His client was the person who restored the acequia.

Dr. Kantner asked what the finish on the garage door would be.

Mr. Jordan said it would be painted to match the stucco.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Rios moved to approve Case #H-12-005 per staff recommendations and a condition that the cantilever be reduced to 18" Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

2. **Case #H-13-004 918 E. Acequia Madre.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture Studio, agent for Eastside Partners LLC, owners, proposes to construct an approximately 1,325 sq. ft. at 15' 9", the maximum allowable height addition to this non-contributing residence. (John Murphey).

Mr. Murphey presented the staff report for this case as follows:

#### **BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Located down a winding dirt lane, approximately 450' from Acequia Madre, the subject property is a 1,420 square-foot, single-story adobe residence constructed in the 1980s in the vernacular Spanish-Pueblo Revival style. It is noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District. There is no public visibility of the house.

#### **Project**

The applicant proposes to construct an approximately 1,325 square-foot addition across the south elevation of the house.

#### **Addition**

The addition, Spanish-Pueblo Revival in design, will be centered on a courtyard, off which will be a roughly L-plan dwelling containing separate dining/great room and master bedroom wings and an attached two-car garage. The parapets will reach 15'-9", the maximum allowable height for the address. New windows will be of a variety of operations (mostly casement) and light patterns, with their cladding in a dark brown color. The portals will be made of wood and stained also in a dark brown color.

### **Existing Dwelling**

As part of the project, the parapet of the existing house will increase to 15'-9". The project will remove the front entry portal to create additional interior space. Current windows will be replaced to harmonize with units proposed for the addition. Both the existing house and the addition will be clad with cementitious adobe brown stucco.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the application, as it complies with City of Santa Fe Land Use Code, Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Walker said in the prior case and in this one, the only notice was at end of dead-end road and the only people who could see it were those who went to the end of that road.

Ms. Brennan said it was compliant with the code. Changing the code might be helpful. It had to be on the property and that sign was compliant.

Ms. Mather asked if the Adobe Brown stucco color was a dark color. Chair Woods said it was not.

Ms. Mather asked about the windows type.

Mr. Murphey said they were all casement windows.

Present and sworn was Mr. Richard Martínez, 1524 Paseo de Peralta, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Rios asked how much square footage would be added.

Ms. Mather noted that 1,325 was in the letter. Mr. Martínez agreed.

Ms. Rios felt the proposed windows were an improvement.

Ms. Mather asked him to describe the new front door on the west elevation.

Mr. Martínez clarified that was a doorway into the courtyard and was an iron gate.



Dr. Kantner asked him if he had a description of the light fixtures.

Mr. Martínez said he did not.

Ms. Rios asked about rooftop appurtenances.

Mr. Martinez said they were replacing the HVAC and would use the existing ductwork. That was why they were raising the parapets to hide them. They also had low profile skylights that were not visible.

## PUBLIC COMMENT

Present and sworn was Ms. Martha Sanders, 3574 Hwy 14 and owners of 918 C and 918 D East Acequia Madre. She had two concerns. The first was about having the public notice way at the back and not public. The neighbors had no clue it was happening. She said she owned the road and they had an easement they just bought from her brother. As a person came up the road past A, B and C the sign was not publicly visible. They only way she knew about the project was that it was at the entrance of their property.

This was a small dirt road and she was concerned with construction and vehicle traffic and the noise there. It was a very old quiet neighborhood and they would be bothered by the construction and traffic.

Ms. Brennan explained that the Board's jurisdiction was not over traffic. That would be addressed by the Permitting Division of Land Use and applicant. Notice was given in multiple ways. The agenda was published in newspaper and on their website 15 days in advance and also in the City Hall building. The notice was compliant.

Ms. Rios asked Ms. Sanders if she had an opportunity to look at the plans.

Ms. Sanders said she didn't have the opportunity and hadn't seen anything. The concerns she had were noise and traffic and with all the people coming and going as their property. There was an arroyo and they owned to the middle of the arroyo and their property at 918 C abutted this property and would affect 918 C and they had to go past it to get to their property. D was right next to it. So she was concerned with all of it.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Mr. Katz moved in Case #H-13-004 to approve the proposal with the condition that light fixtures by the front gate be submitted to staff for review and approval as well as any other exterior light fixtures publicly visible. Ms. Mather seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

### **3. Case #H-13-005 512 Calle Corvo. Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Martínez Architecture**

Studio, agent for Donald and Katherine Wallace, owners, proposes to replace windows and modify rear portal roof on a non-contributing residence, construct a 128 sq. ft. addition and an awning over the entry door on a non-contributing guest house, modify the vehicle gate, and construct an outdoor fireplace and BBQ. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch shared a handout [attached as Exhibit 1]

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

### **BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

512 Calle Corvo is a single-family residence with a free-standing converted garage studio that was constructed in a simplified Santa Fe style after 1945. In 2004, the HDRB confirmed the historic status of the structures as non-contributing to Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

The applicant proposes to remodel the property with the following six items.

1. All of the single-pane steel casement windows will be removed and replaced with thermal-pane metal clad wood windows.
  - a. The picture window on the north elevation is publicly-visible and it does not comply with the 30" rule (Section 14-5.2)(E)(2)(b)) and an exception has not been requested.
  - b. A window opening on the east elevation will be shortened.
  - c. A window opening on the west elevation will be enlarged to meet ingress/egress standards.
2. The rear portal area will be altered with the following:
  - a. The open roof section will be infilled with a 2.5' x 8' skylight and more corrugated steel that will match existing roofing material.
  - b. A stucco-clad fireplace will be constructed on the portal south side.
  - c. A stucco-clad barbeque will be constructed on the portal east side.
3. A 128 square foot addition will be constructed on the north elevation of the studio. The addition will match existing height and width and existing windows will be reused.
4. A wooden canopy with corrugated metal cladding and a support bracket under each side will be installed at the studio entry door on the west elevation.
5. The driveway entry wall opening and vehicle gate will be altered.
  - a. The wall opening dimension will be increased from 11' to 14' wide to accommodate a tight turning radius.
  - b. The existing iron vehicle gates will be reused and attached to a wider frame.
6. An undescribed pedestrian gate will be installed in the existing coyote fence at the rear of the residence.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards, Height Pitch Scale and Massing and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Ms. Mather asked if the Board got the colors on the new windows and stucco.

Mr. Rasch said they didn't.

Ms. Walker asked if the undescribed gate had since been described.

Mr. Rasch said it had not.

Mr. Martínez said the gate will be a coyote gate because that was what existed there now.

The finish of windows would match existing color of the windows. They were turquoise.

He added that the owners couldn't be here. He read a note she wrote [Attached as Exhibit 2].

Mr. Martínez said the existing window didn't meet the 30" rule but they wanted to match that configuration. He handed out a description [attached as Exhibit 3].

Ms. Mather asked about replacing a window that was more than 50 years old.

Chair Woods thought the choice they made was good and wanted to make sure he didn't need an exception.

Ms. Brennan said since it was a replacement it had been approved before.

Mr. Rasch commented that I couldn't hear.

Ms. Walker asked how high the gate would be.

Mr. Martínez said it would be the same height as the existing fence at 5.5'. It would just look like part of the coyote fence when closed.

Mr. Katz asked if the portal was deeper in back.

Mr. Martínez said they were keeping the current portal and just adding roofing.

Ms. Rios asked about the small wrought iron gates that were out of proportion of the wall.

Mr. Martínez said the wall was raised a few years ago and gates were from the old wall. The gates he proposed would incorporate those gates with a frame around them as a panel in the new gate. There was an elevation shown in his drawings on page 14.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-13-005 with the conditions that the color of stucco and windows color match existing and the gate would be coyote to match the existing fence and the front window was a stylistic replacement of the original. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Rios asked for a friendly amendment that the skylights not be visible Ms. Mather agreed and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 4. Case #H-13-006 540 E. Palace Avenue.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Aaron Bohrer, agent for Meem-Santa Fe LP, owner, proposes to remodel a non-contributing residence by increasing the heights of lower parapets while maintaining room-block massing, constructing a 209 sq. ft. pergola and courtyard walls to 5' high with pedestrian gates, and perform other minor modifications. (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

540 East Palace Avenue is a compound of five residences and a guest house. The main historic building, known as the Mrs. Ashley Pond House, was design by John Gaw Meem and constructed in the Territorial Revival style by 1930. That residence and the attached guest house are listed as a contributing structure in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The four recently constructed Santa Fe Style residences will be remodeled and/or finished for habitation.

Now, the new owner proposes to remodel Unit 3 or D at the southeast corner of the property fronting on East Alameda Street with the following six items.

- 1 Lower parapets will be raised to within 6" of the highest parapet in order to maintain a sense of room-block massing. One of the lower parapets will be raised 24" to create a mechanical enclosure.
2. The two portals on the south elevation will be removed and a 209 square foot pergola will be constructed. The simplified design is similar to the previously approved portals and at the same height.
3. The west elevation portal will be altered to add second columns at each existing column to match the existing Territorial design. Also, a 3' high wrought iron balustrade will enclose the portal.

4. Several door issues will be resolved.
  - a. The bedroom door will be moved from the south elevation to the east elevation.
  - b. The mechanical room door on the west elevation will be removed and infilled with stuccoed wall.
  - c. A divided-lite door with transom will be installed on the west elevation at the north end of the living room.
5. Yardwalls at 5' high constructed with stuccoed adobe will be placed inside the perimeter yardwall at the south and east elevations. Wooden pedestrian gates will be installed under stepped arches.
6. The building will be restuccoed to match the existing material, texture, and color.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of this application which complies with Section 14-5.2(D) General Design Standards and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District.

Chair Woods asked what the proposed wall height was. Mr. Rasch didn't have that. Dr. Kantner said it was shown on page 15.

Chair Woods didn't have a page 15.

Dr. Kantner thought it looked like it was 14.5".

Chair Woods said it was already higher than the street so she had concerns.

Present and sworn was Mr. Aaron Bohrer, 6001 Jaguar Drive, who had nothing to add to the staff report.

Chair Woods asked where the masses were being raised and what the height of the building was.

Mr. Bohrer had foam boards to show the existing and the proposed. The mass would be continuous with the mass at the chimney. It was 14' 1.5" and the proposal was to keep the rest of the project six inches below this mass.

He explained he was doing it for durability. The current roof was within six inches of the parapet top. There were already leaks inside the building and this would help with a durability detail for longevity of the building. It was pretty modest in what they were raising except for the area in the back where a mechanical surround would be built at the same height of the chimney.

Chair Woods asked if he showed that surround in the elevation.

Mr. Rasch showed the mechanical screen. Chimneys, like rooftop equipment were not part of the maximum height but it did maintain the height in the massing. It would be the highest part of the building.

He was asking to add height to the building but still was within maximum height.

Chair Woods asked if it was going all the way around. Mr. Bohrer agreed.

Dr. Kantner asked if the mechanical screen was set back. Mr. Bohrer agreed.

Mr. Boniface asked how much he was raising the lower parapet.

Mr. Bohrer said it was 10".

Chair Woods asked if the Board could include that in their motion. Mr. Bohrer agreed.

Ms. Mather said regarding the stepped massing over the gates that she didn't see where the stepped design fit into a Territorial design, especially a Meem design. She asked if they were not trying to match the original house.

Mr. Bohrer said they did have more of a pueblo style on the walls so they would match those. They were not visible.

Ms. Mather asked if the carport posts would be painted.

Mr. Bohrer said they were stained cypress.

Mr. Katz asked if he was abandoning the window on the bedroom.

Mr. Bohrer said that was a door and it would be moved.

Chair Woods asked how high the gate and then the height to the top of the stucco.

Mr. Bohrer said it was 8' and the door would be six eight.

Chair Woods said it also had an iron transom.

Mr. Bohrer said it was 6'8" to the bottom of the exposed beam.

Chair Woods said it seemed impossible to keep it at 8' on these two stepped masses over the gate. She asked if he would consider just a column on either side and nothing on top so it was simplified and beautiful. The column could be slightly higher than the gate.

Mr. Bohrer asked if she meant a stucco column. Chair Woods agreed. She felt it would calm things down on the street.

Mr. Bohrer thought that seemed more than reasonable. He agreed to that change.

Ms. Rios asked what the interior ceiling height was of the portion where they were raising it.

Mr. Bohrer said it varied from 9 to 10 feet. They were not touching the roof but just raising the parapet.

Mr. Boniface said it was hard to read these plans but it looked like the gate on the right side of south elevation seemed to be 5' to the top of the gate and wall and another 2' 6" to very top of the stuccoed wall above the gate.

Mr. Rasch said it measured 7.5'.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Chair Woods thanked Mr. Bohrer for his work here. The property had been an eyesore for some time and the Board appreciated the project.

Mr. Bohrer asked regarding the gate if she was suggesting an 18" pier on either side and no beam on top.

Chair Woods suggested maybe 3-6" above the wall and asked if he would consider wood instead of wrought iron. The Board generally preferred wood.

Mr. Bohrer said the exterior doors were stained cypress but the portals were painted so he asked if the Board was recommending painted wood where he proposed wrought iron.

Chair Woods asked for his preference there.

Mr. Boniface thought the paint would probably be more appropriate because it would blend in rather than stand out.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-13-006 with the conditions that raising of parapets will be no greater than 10 inches; that the gates won't have stepped massing or a beam above but stuccoed pilasters on either side and that the balustrades be either painted or stained. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion.**

**Chair Woods suggested an amendment to allow brick on top. Ms. Mather agreed the amendment was friendly and the motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

- 5. Case #H-13-010 303 E. Alameda.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Wayne S. Lloyd, agent for Schepps/New Mexico, owner, proposes to construct an approximately 600 sq. ft. 14' high porte-cochere and connected entry pergola across this non-contributing commercial building. (John Murphey)

Mr. Murphey presented the staff report for this case as follows:

**BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY:**

Constructed in 1985, 303 East Alameda, the Tower Building, is a large, multi-mass structure crowned by a two-story Spanish-Pueblo Revival-style tower. Containing the front desk, lobby and breakfast buffet area of the Inn on the Alameda, the building is noncontributing to the Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

**Project**

To provide shelter and more presence along the Alameda, the applicant is proposing two accent structures to the south elevation of the building.

**Porte-Cochere**

To be attached in front of the Tower Building's main entrance, and extending to the east, is proposed a Spanish-Pueblo Revival-style porte-cochere. It will be approximately 14'-0" high and cover 600 square feet. Stylistic elements will include cut-through canales, vigas, wood posts and carved corbels. The asphalt below the structure will be removed and replaced with stamped colored concrete to harmonize with the building.

**Pergola/Entry**

Over the vehicular entry, is proposed an approximately 29'-0"-long, 13'-5"-high pergola. It will be of a simple design of wood cross rafters arranged at wide intervals over concrete girders, and supported by the porte-cochere at the west end and a battered stucco post at the east end. The girders will be colored concrete to match the building. Across the south girder will read in recessed letters: "INN OF THE ALAMEDA."

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the application, as it complies with City of Santa Fe Land Use Code, Section 14-5.2 (D)(9), General Design Standards (Height, Pitch, Scale and Massing), and (E), Downtown and Eastside Historic District.

Present and sworn was Mr. Wayne Lloyd, 100 N. Guadalupe, who corrected the sign wording from Inn of the Alameda to Inn on the Alameda.

Chair Woods referred to page 9, east elevation at the top, where she was confused by this layering of roof structure - horizontal and something in between and another horizontal with vigas on top.

Mr. Lloyd described it. The vigas were going north and south and latillas going east and west.

Chair Woods liked the porte-cochere which mitigated the two a little bit. But with all the massing of the building it looked a little thin.



Mr. Lloyd said the beam with the name on it could be bigger and might help. He couldn't disagree that the beam could be four inches deeper and it wouldn't hurt at all.

Chair Woods asked if it would make sense on that pilaster on the far right that it could be stuccoed.

Mr. Lloyd agreed that could help. He wanted it to be lighter. Certainly it boiled down to personal taste. He put corners on the porte cochere and the owner wanted columns. He didn't have stucco going across the pergola so how it met the horizontal beam needed to be done sensitively.

Chair Woods said what he had done met the code.

Mr. Lloyd didn't want the clearance to be lowered. They would raise it higher and keep the proportion of porte-cochere the same.

Mr. Boniface asked if it was all wood above the beam and what the diameter of the viga was.

Mr. Lloyd said the owner wanted wood rather than concrete and the vigas would be 10-12".

Ms. Rios said in her mind less was better and she would leave the beam as it was so not to draw attention to it.

Mr. Lloyd said it was about a 23' span.

Ms. Walker asked what the purpose of the pergola was.

Mr. Lloyd said it was to give the strongest sense of entry so the first-time patron could find it. Right now the signage was all to the west on the little wall - a little white sign on the lower portion and if they turn right off Paseo they couldn't see the sign at all.

Ms. Walker asked why they wouldn't put a larger sign south of the porte cochere.

Mr. Lloyd said the sign gives a strong sense of entry which it doesn't have now.

Mr. Rasch asked how many signs were on the property.

Mr. Lloyd said there was only one.

Mr. Rasch said they could have three so this would be two signs.

Ms. Mather surmised they were no longer going to be using colored concrete on the pergola.

Mr. Lloyd agreed. It would be stained to match existing wood.

Chair Woods asked what his preference was on the size of the beam.

Mr. Lloyd preferred adding four inches and adding four inches to the parapet.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve Case #H-13-010 as submitted and recommended and with the condition that the pergola will be carved wood and the girder and the parapet could be raised as much as four inches at the discretion of the applicant. Mr. Katz seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

6. **Case #H-13-009 1020 Canyon Road.** Downtown & Eastside Historic District. Cody North, agent for 1020 CNYN LLC, owners, proposes to remodel three contributing residences and two non-contributing residences into three residences with additions at 473 sq. ft. Between 1020 and 1020A; 487 sq. ft. between 1020C and 1020D and 662 sq. ft. on 1020B. In addition, a 20 sq. ft. carport and yardwalls will be constructed. The exceptions are requested to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary façade (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)). (David Rasch)

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

**BACKGROUND & SUMMARY:**

1020 Canyon Road is a compound of five structures (1020, 1020A, 1020B, 1020C, and 1020D) that were constructed between 1947 and 1959 in the Spanish-Pueblo Revival style in the Downtown & Eastside Historic District. The following are the designations of historic status and primary elevations, if applicable, for these structures as established in 2010:

1020 contributing with the north and east elevations as primary;  
1020A contributing with the east and south elevations as primary;  
1020B contributing with the east elevation, excluding the south addition, as primary;  
1020C non-contributing;  
1020D non-contributing.

The new owner proposes to remodel the property in two phases. The first phase proposes to make three residences out of the existing five residences and the second phase will construct four additional residences of comparable size to these three residences in the vacant area at the back of the property. This hearing is for phase one only. However, the applicant would appreciate preliminary advice on phase two.

**1020 and 1020A will be combined as Unit A.**

1020 is a 921 square foot building and 1020A is a 728 square foot building. A 514 square foot addition will be constructed between these two contributing structures to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height for 1020 is 15' 3" and the maximum allowable height for 1020A is 14' 6" with a total

footprint of 2,119 square feet.

The non-primary elevation 44 square foot shed on the south elevation will be removed.

The primary elevation historic wood windows and doors will be repaired and preserved, as well as a non-primary elevation window on the south elevation.

The cementitious stucco color will be "La Luz" with "Bamboo" under the portals. Wood elements will have a clear sealer without color.

Exterior light fixtures will be metal wall sconces with a "Rusty" patina.

**1020B will be enlarged and remain as Unit B.**

1020B is a 1,289 square foot building. A 662 square foot addition will be constructed to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 5".

**1020C and 1020D will be combined as Unit C.**

1020C is a 721 square foot building and 1020D is a 628 square foot building. A 487 square foot addition will be constructed between these two non-contributing structures to a height of 13' 3" where the maximum allowable height for 1020C is 15' 3" and the maximum allowable height for 1020D is 14' 4".

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the exception requests to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation. Also, staff defers to the Board as to whether or not the taller additions to the contributing buildings are harmonious or overwhelming to the historic status and otherwise recommends approval of the project as it complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the condition that the carport shall have a flat roof or an exception shall be requested and that coyote fences shall have irregular length tops or be changed to picket fences with even length tops.

Chair Woods asked Ms. Brennan about 2D if with two contributing buildings there was no way to take two separate houses in one foot print so they would need to ask for a downgrade or an exception.

Ms. Brennan said the Board could hear the case but if it decided connecting would impair historic status the Board would deny it.

Chair Woods asked how they could keep two contributing buildings.

Ms. Brennan read the contributing code and said if the two contributing structures maintained design integrity and met the other code requirements it would be okay but if the proposal impaired the status the

Board must deny it.

Chair Woods agreed they could hear it but they would be losing one contributing structure. She believed there should be an exception.

Present and sworn was Mr. Cody North, 1207 East Lupita, who thought some dimensions in the staff report were off. He had 784 sq. ft. for 1020, 673 sq. ft. for 1020 A and their addition was 470.

Mr. Rasch clarified that he used roofed area for the dimensions.

Mr. North said he just used heated area. They were trying to preserve the integrity of these homes and to make them habitable and attractive for people coming to Santa Fe. They were trying to maintain windows and doors on the historic portions - restoring windows on primary elevations and make them stand out and pushing the addition back. They had asked Mr. Rasch what route they could go and felt this was within the ordinance to connect these two and every attempt made to preserve historic status.

Ms. Rios asked if they were changing any of the openings on a primary façade.

Mr. North said on the north they were swapping out for a picture window but for all the others they were restoring the historic windows and keeping the headers.

Ms. Rios asked if they were raising the height. Mr. North said no.

Ms. Rios asked how they were connecting them.

Mr. North said it would be the south side of 1020 with the north side of 1020 A. There were two windows at those openings and they were making the windows the same size there. If the additions were removed that's where the windows were. They were connecting with adobe, vigas and rough sawn on the ceiling and stucco.

Ms. Rios asked if they considered adding to each instead of connecting them together.

Mr. North said they tried but couldn't without using the primary elevations. They also tried to make 1020A as a guest house but couldn't do it. They could have just had a breezeway but that didn't give a good feel. They needed to make them sellable.

Mr. Katz liked the way he put them together but the addition was so much higher. He asked if there was any way to mitigate that.

Mr. North said they were at 14' with the addition and the maximum was 14' 6". They were at 13' with the step up. He asked if it would be better at 13' all the way across.

Mr. Katz agreed that would help.

Dr. Kantner asked, because the bulk of the new addition was on Canyon Road side if it would be possible to switch the fireplace.

Mr. North explained the step up was for clerestory windows on the south side of the addition to get solar gain. They could move the fireplace if that helped but they were trying to maintain and get a green certification.

Dr. Kantner noted the north elevation was primary. He also felt it was a really tall mass stuck between those two contributing buildings.

Mr. North said they would be willing to lower the parapet height to mitigate that problem.

Ms. Walker thought that would look better but wondered if they added the connection they would lose two contributing buildings.

Mr. Rasch said they could put additions on and the amount of the addition had to be set back. The Board had to decide whether it affected the historic status.

Chair Woods didn't think a connection would work. There was an option of downgrading one of the buildings and then it was within the law. It was either removing it or not but needed to help them get there legally. There were options but they would have to come back to either ask for a downgrade or an exception so they wouldn't lose two contributing buildings. Santa Fe was in the national register because of the percentage of contributing houses and they didn't want to lose that. But the Board wanted to work with the applicant on the project to make it work.

Dr. Kantner wondered if they could ask for an exception or if they would have to ask for downgrade.

Mr. Rasch said they would have to post it for a downgrade. The Board just upgraded it in 2010.

Dr. Kantner thought there had been buildings combined in Agua Fria.

Mr. Rasch didn't think they had ever dealt with combining two contributing buildings before. They did have a connection in one case using a glass bridge.

Ms. Mather had trouble with Chair Woods's point of view and Ms. Brennan said the Board could do this. They were not losing the primary facades on these two structures.

Dr. Kantner thought additions to each would be worse.

Mr. North said he was trying to make them pleasing to the eye.

Mr. Katz didn't think the code dealt with this issue. He thought keeping the primary facades would be

okay and there would only be one fewer contributing building. Both parts would remain contributing.

Ms. Rios said they had to consider the form these buildings presently had. Maybe the design integrity was there but this would not preserve the form and it would change their character. The applicant was preserving and rehabilitating and keeping the integrity of the building but in a way to make it more livable for the standards of today or their future clients.

Mr. North pointed out that any addition would change the form of a historic building.

Ms. Rios agreed but some were more significant changes. Dr. Kantner felt adding to each would be worse so it was a dilemma.

Mr. Rasch said the public visibility was not possible so the only public visibility was 1020.

Ms. Rios asked how far it was from the street.

Mr. Rasch said 1020A was probably 40-50 feet from the street.

Present and sworn was Ms. Barbara Fix, 610 Alicia, who said, thanks to Ms. Walker, she was owner of the house across the street at 715 and was delighted that those houses might be inhabited again. Uninhabited houses detracted so much. Her house had been a residence about 80 years and this was an attempt to bring back a neighborhood and making it strong. They were fostering affordable housing and apart from historic issues, connecting was far better than doing two additions. One of her concerns was that those houses were high above Canyon Road and asked if they were going to tear up the asphalt and use the ground which was much better than paving.

Mr. North agreed; they would use gravel.

Ms. Fix said drainage had been her main concern because the property was quite high and possibly a lot of silt and dirt could come down to Canyon Road and that should be adequately addressed.

Chair Woods explained that was not under HDRB jurisdiction but the Building Department had requirements on it and it would be addressed with them.

Ms. Fix also liked that the houses would have different colors of stuccos for variety there. She was really glad that this property wouldn't be allowed to deteriorate further and wanted to give her support for it.

Present and sworn was Ms. Ann Church who lived behind on the southeast corner and abutted this property. It had been an eyesore for a decade and she was glad to see it happening. Her only consideration was some of perimeter fencing, especially on the south where it appeared to be on top of the rock wall. Having a coyote fence on top would give the effect of a 12' high fence and that would significantly change her light there. She said her wall was a very short wall and they planned to put a fence on top of her wall and that was not going to work.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Rios asked if the stucco color on these two units would be the same or different.

Mr. North said they would use La Luz on these.

**Dr. Kantner in Case #H-13-009 Unit A, moved to approve as proposed with a requirement that the addition parapet be lowered to what was shown on the north side. Ms. Mather seconded the motion.**

Ms. Walker felt she could not vote for it and would abstain because she wasn't clear on the code.

Dr. Kantner would defer to the City attorney. He thought this was the best adaptive use of the two buildings.

Mr. Katz said his sense was that the code dealt with style and preservation. A classification of contributing meant it had design features to be preserved. They couldn't add on to significant structures but this was contributing so he felt comfortable voting in favor because they weren't losing contributing façades. That was the difference so he thought this was appropriate.

Dr. Kantner added that the vernacular style combined additions.

Ms. Mather agreed with Dr. Kantner and that was an important part of their ordinance that historic buildings continue to be used. This was a good adaptive use.

Ms. Walker acknowledged those were good points but she still don't think the Board could vote.

Ms. Rios said her colleagues convinced me to go forward with the project. She had been of the opinion that they should remain apart but this was a sensitive connection.

Chair Woods thanked the Board for thinking it through.

**The motion to approve with conditions passed by majority voice vote with five voting in favor and Ms. Walker abstained..**

## **Unit B -**

Mr. Rasch gave report on Unit B as follows:

**1020B will be enlarged and remain as Unit B**

1020B is a 1,289 square foot building. Additions on the northwest and east sides at 662 square feet will be constructed to a height of 13' where the maximum allowable height is 14' 5" with a total footprint of 1,706 square feet. Two exceptions were requested: to exceed the 50% footprint rule (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and to step back the addition less than 10 feet from a primary elevation. The required exception responses are at the end of this report.

The non-historic portal on the east elevation of the addition will be removed and a larger addition will be placed in this location. An exception is requested to place an addition at less than 10' back from the east primary elevation (Section 14-5.2(D)(2)(d)) and the required exception responses are at the end of this report.

The primary elevation historic wood windows and door will be repaired and preserved, as well as a non-primary elevation window on the south elevation.

The cementitious stucco color will be "La Luz" with "Bamboo" under the portals. Wood elements will have a clear sealer without color and new windows will have a "Poplar White" cladding color.

Exterior light fixtures will be metal wall sconces with a "Rusty" patina.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the exception requests to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation. Also, staff defers to the Board as to whether or not the taller additions to the contributing buildings are harmonious or overwhelming to the historic status and otherwise recommends approval of the project as it complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the condition that the carport shall have a flat roof or an exception shall be requested and that coyote fences shall have irregular length tops or be changed to picket fences with even length tops.

#### **EXCEPTION FOR UNIT B TO EXCEED THE 50% FOOTPRINT RULE**

(I) Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

The proposed additions will be recessed from the primary elevation and will not change the character of the streetscape. We intend to further protect the streetscape by using cementitious stucco, divided lite windows and high quality craftsmanship. The scale and massing of the contributing portion as seen from the street will remain unchanged. The main addition will be set back from the primary elevation by at least 10 feet and tucked around the rear of the home.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.



- (ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

The additions will prevent the hardship of having a home that is too small for the standards of today's lifestyle requirements. The proposed additions are essential to making a comfortable sized home that works. The addition will be minimized by access from a private drive and thus not be a detriment to the public welfare.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

The unique heterogeneous character of the city will be strengthened by our placement of the additions and the materials used to give the residence a more useable space in the historic district and the eastside neighborhood. We will be building with or replicating authentic materials with the highest craftsmanship to ensure that residents will continue to be comfortable in our great historic city. We are flexible on exterior materials like stucco colors, sconce design, and yard wall material to ensure a harmonious merge within the historic district.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape.

The home has been left unattended and neglected thus requiring us to restore the integrity and vernacular of the home. We are using the space we have on the property to make the home usable once again while maintaining the integrity of the historic home.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant.

We have been in possession of the home for three months thus having no part in the neglect of this home. The home is in dire need of attention or we risk losing one of our historic homes.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

- (vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

By keeping our additions off the primary elevation we are having the least negative impact on the preservation of this historic structure. By keeping the additions as small as possible we are having the least negative impact on the historic style. We are having the least negative impact on the

historic design by building in a harmonious style, color, proportion and material to the existing dwelling. This restoration will attract tourists and residents to our city while raising property values.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

**EXCEPTION FOR UNIT B TO PLACE AN ADDITION AT LESS THAN 10' BACK FROM A PRIMARY ELEVATION**

(I) Do not damage the character of the streetscape.

The addition will be in line with the existing portal of the south wing which is set back and will not change the character of the streetscape. We intend to further protect the streetscape by using cementitious stucco, divided lite windows and high quality craftsmanship. The scale and massing of the contributing portion as seen from the street will remain unchanged.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(ii) Prevent a hardship to the applicant or an injury to the public welfare.

This addition will be preventing a hardship by allowing us to access the bedroom suite through the addition instead of through the kitchen which would make the kitchen much too small to be functional. The addition will render the building much more usable and utile. The addition will be minimized by access from a private drive and thus not be a detriment to the public welfare.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(iii) Strengthen the unique heterogeneous character of the city by providing a full range of design options to ensure that residents can continue to reside within the historic districts.

The unique heterogeneous character of the city will be strengthened by our placement of the addition and the materials used to give the residence a more useable space in the historic district and the eastside neighborhood. We will be building with or replicating authentic materials with the highest craftsmanship to ensure that residents will continue to be drawn to our great historic city. We are flexible on exterior materials like stucco colors, sconce design, and yard wall material to ensure a harmonious merge within the historic district.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(iv) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are peculiar to the land or structure involved and which are not applicable to other lands or structures in the related streetscape.

The home has been left unattended and neglected thus requiring us to restore the integrity and vernacular of the home. We are using the space we have on the property to make the home usable once again while maintaining the integrity of the historic home. The home won't allow us to put the

addition anywhere else without compromising its historic nature.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(v) Are due to special conditions and circumstances which are not a result of the actions of the applicant.

We have been in possession of the home for three months thus having no part in the neglect of this home. The home is in dire need of attention or we risk losing one of our historic homes.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

(vi) Provide the least negative impact with respect to the purpose of this section as set forth in Subsection 14-5.2(A)(1).

By keeping our additions off the primary elevation we are having the least negative impact on the preservation of this historic structure. By keeping the additions as small as possible we are having the least negative impact on the historic style. We are having the least negative impact on the historic design by building in a harmonious style, color, proportion and material to the existing dwelling. This restoration will attract tourists and residents to our city while raising property values.

Staff response: Staff agrees with this statement.

Mr. Katz asked how far the addition was setback from the primary elevation.

Mr. Rasch didn't know but would measure it.

Mr. Katz asked how they calculated the footprint.

Mr. Rasch said there was non-historic square footage already there that came off per Section D of the code.

Ms. Mather asked where the 13' high addition was.

Mr. Rasch said the north addition was taller. It went only to one corner and not around the back.

Mr. North said you could see it on the back elevations. The intent was of closing in the portal. It was a recessed portal that went along the same plane as the primary elevation and he hoped the Board would see that. They kept lower everything that they could keep lower.

Mr. Rasch said the addition on the south side was from the new addition wall that was just over five feet and 10.5' from the portal. The primary were east and south. And they were bringing the addition over to close in that space.

Chair Woods asked about the heights of the walls.

Mr. Rasch clarified that was not part of the case.

Ms. Rios asked if this proposal kept the primary façades .

Mr. Rasch said he asked for an exception. In this part they had additions on both sides.

There were no speakers from the public regarding this case.

Mr. North said they were trying to preserve these houses that had been neglected for many years but would hate to lose contributing houses from neglect of too many years.

**Ms. Mather moved to approve #H-13-009 part 1020B as submitted and citing the exception criteria were met on the 50% footprint rule and on less than ten feet setback from a primary façade. Dr. Kantner seconded the motion and it passed by unanimous voice vote.**

#### **Part C -**

Mr. Rasch presented the staff report for this case as follows:

#### **1020C and 1020D will be combined as Unit C**

1020C is a 721 square foot building and 1020D is a 628 square foot building. Additions between these two non-contributing structures and on the north and west sides at 593 square feet will be to a height of 13' 3" where the maximum allowable height for 1020C is 15' 3" and the maximum allowable height for 1020D is 14' 4" with a total footprint of 1,821 square feet.

The greenhouse addition and front entry pergola will be removed.

All windows will be replaced with clad divided-lite units in a "Poplar White" cladding color. All doors will be replaced with divided-lite windows with a clear wood finish.

The cementitious stucco color will be "Madera" with "Bamboo" under the portals.

Exterior light fixtures will be metal wall sconces with a "Ferric" patina.

A free-standing 238 (??) square foot carport will be constructed on the north side of Unit C. The metal roof has a slight shed pitch which is not traditional. A pitch is not allowed at this location and a pitch exception has not been requested.

#### **Site Work**

Yardwalls surround the property on the west, south, and east lotlines and a low historic stone wall fronts the property on Canyon Road. Yardwalls with fences are proposed to define each Unit. The maximum allowable height for interior walls and fences is 8' while the street frontage maximum allowable height is 58".

The coyote fences appear rather like picket fences with even length tops and some will be placed upon stuccoed or stone walls.

Pedestrian gates will be wood with panels and those at Units A and C will have stuccoed accent arches. Some walls have windows filled with wooden spindles.

The central driveway will have "hard surface" and gravel.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff recommends approval of the exception requests to exceed the 50% footprint rule and to construct an addition at less than 10' back from a primary elevation. Also, staff defers to the Board as to whether or not the taller additions to the contributing buildings are harmonious or overwhelming to the historic status and otherwise recommends approval of the project as it complies with Section 14-5.2(C) Regulation of Contributing Structures, (D) General Design Standards, and (E) Downtown & Eastside Historic District with the condition that the carport shall have a flat roof or an exception shall be requested and that coyote fences shall have irregular length tops or be changed to picket fences with even length tops.

The Staff recommendation included that the carport should have a flat report and the coyote fence have uneven tops.

At the request of Ms. Mather Mr. North described the walls for this project.

Mr. North said everything on west would stay the same. On the east he pointed out an existing wall. All block walls were existing and they planned on stepping up with coyote fence with irregular tops starting well off the street and going to six feet on the high side.

Chair Woods asked what the height was on the lower side.

Mr. North said it would vary. He thought they could do six feet from the high side.

Chair Woods asked if it was 8' on the low side.

Mr. North said their side was the low side.

Present and sworn was Mr. Michael Grant, Agua Fria, who said the entire east perimeter was within one foot difference from one side to the other. He believed the neighbor was referring to the south where a three-foot retaining wall held the driveway and they wanted to put in a six foot coyote fence.

Ms. Walker excused herself from the meeting at 7:56

Mr. Grant said they were not imagining that this neighbor would have more than a six foot barrier to their property. This was for phase 2.

Mr. North said on their side they would do a retaining wall of three feet on their property. That would be in their second proposal.

Mr. Grant added that they would step it down so it wouldn't be a huge oppressive sight.

Chair Woods asked if they were requesting that later for phase 2.

Mr. North clarified that they were asking for it now.

Mr. Rasch said the code indicated the measurement was read from the higher grade when not on the street.

Ms. Mather was having a little trouble doing fences on a property that was not to be developed now.

Mr. North said they were only asking for the perimeter and the interior walls were only on just phase 1.

Mr. Katz noted that on the north elevation Canyon Road was the side on the left. He asked if there would be cars parked behind that wall.

Mr. North said no. There would be a pond and trash containers there. It would be a pond, a path, open space then a retaining wall and cars back of that.

Mr. Rasch added that was where the carport was located.

Ms. Church spoke again, asking if at that time the coyote fencing was going around the entire perimeter.

Mr. North said it would not be on the west side but would be on portions of the east side and all of the south side.

Ms. Church asked if the coyote fence would be on top.

Chair Woods said from the bottom of the rock wall and up to six feet was allowed.

Mr. North said there was a road behind that three-foot retaining wall and it would go up from the bottom of the retaining wall up to six feet.

Chair Woods was confused by the discussion.

Ms. Church said the retaining wall was about the height of the desk here. She asked if they could go up six more feet or six feet total.

Mr. North said they wanted six feet above the top of the retaining wall.

Chair Woods asked from a streetscape perspective what the impact would be on the streetscape. If they put six feet on top of the retaining wall she asked how high that would make it.

Mr. North said it would be 8' inside.

Chair Woods said the neighbor said there was a five foot retaining wall there.

Mr. North said the retaining wall was about 2.5 feet.

Chair Woods said the board members did not look at this on their site visit so the Board should probably postpone it so the Board could go look at what it would look like

Mr. North asked if the Board could postpone just the south or would they have to postpone the east wall as well.

Mr. Katz asked if the neighbor's concern was just with the south or something else.

Ms. Church said her elevation was two feet higher so she wanted to know at her house what the height would be. On the south it would be massive.

There were no other speakers from the public regarding this case.

Ms. Mather was concerned because the Board didn't go back and look at any of the fencing. They didn't look from any point of view at all.

Chair Woods said the Board could approve part of the application and postpone part of it.

Ms. Rios asked if part of the application was to propose walls and fences on 1020 and 1020A. Mr. North agreed.

Mr. North said for the compound they could do 8' on the interior and it would be 6' 6" on the high side and varied with the terrain. He clarified that this was within the 25' setback.

Mr. Rasch agreed. It was set back from the historic stone wall about 25'.

Mr. North said the taller wall wouldn't be seen from the streetscape. It was the same with the coyote fence which would be 360' back from Canyon Road. He understood the Board didn't look at the south but he was asking for approval on the east for security. If they didn't agree on the south side, he thought they could do a chain link fence.

Chair Woods said they could install a temporary chain link for the construction period.

Ms. Mather noted Mr. Rasch's concern on the sloped roof on the carport and she shared that concern. She asked Mr. North if he would object to doing away with the slope.

Mr. North said they had already redrawn it to be a flat roof.

Dr. Kantner asked if the yard wall stucco color would match each house.

Mr. North agreed. They would match the houses with the yard wall.

**Dr. Kantner moved in reference to Case #H-13-009 that the yardwalls and unit C be approved as proposed with the condition that carport not have a pitched roof, that the east property yardwall and the north property yard wall were approved as proposed and south wall would be brought back later. Mr. Boniface seconded the motion.**

**Ms. Mather requested a friendly amendment that the coyote fence tops be irregular. Dr. Kantner agreed.**

**Mr. Katz was unclear when looking at site plan and asked for a friendly amendment to just approve the walls/fences for phase 1 and leave the rest for next phase.**

**Dr. Kantner said that would apply to the east and south and agreed it was friendly. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.**

Chair Woods thought they were pretty much overwhelmed on the walls.

Ms. Mather noticed and was not sure she was seeing it correctly that pitched roofs were a concern.

Mr. North said they wanted to see if the Board would approve one pitched roof in the seven units. Canyon Road does have lots of pitched roofs.

Mr. Grant said they thought originally to make anything match but Mr. Rasch wanted to see differences



so that was where the pitched roof came in.

Mr. North said the rest was fine.

Dr. Kantner thought that would be acceptable.

Ms. Mather said the Board hadn't really looked at pitches. She felt the applicants did well on it.

Chair Woods was concerned with a lot of mass on the little lane off Canyon Road. She made comments on what she was looking for.

#### **I. MATTERS FROM THE BOARD**

Mr. O'Reilly gave the Board an update on the fire at 350 E Alameda. The Land Use personnel went out on Friday and ordered Martinez Street closed because the SE corner was going to collapse. By Friday evening the building had been completely boarded and shore up on the east side. The structural engineer redesigned the shoring and assured staff that the wall would not collapse onto Martinez Street. So some or all of it could be saved. There was ongoing investigation on the cause of the fire.

Chair Woods thanked for doing that and with sensitivity to that great building.

#### **J. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:22 p.m.

Approved by:



Sharon Woods, Chair

Submitted by:



Carl Boaz, Stenographer